arXiv:1207.5189v1 [math.NT] 21 Jul 2012

Optimal $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy bounds for higher order digital sequences over the finite field $\mathbb{F}_2$

Josef Dick *and Friedrich Pillichshammer †

Abstract

We show that the $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy of the explicitly constructed infinite sequences of points $(\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, \ldots)$ in $[0,1)^s$ over $\mathbb{F}_2$ introduced in [J. Dick, Walsh spaces containing smooth functions and quasi-Monte Carlo rules of arbitrary high order. SIAM J. Numer. Anal., **46**, 1519–1553, 2008] satisfy

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,N}(\{\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{N-1}\}) \le C_s N^{-1} (\log N)^{s/2} \quad \text{for all } N \ge 2,$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,2^m}(\{\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{2^m-1}\}) \le C_s 2^{-m} m^{(s-1)/2} \quad \text{for all } m \ge 1,$$

where $C_s > 0$ is a constant independent of N and m. These results are best possible by lower bounds in [P.D. Proinov, On the L^2 discrepancy of some infinite sequences. Serdica, **11**, 3–12, 1985] and [K. F. Roth, On irregularities of distribution. Mathematika, **1**, 73–79, 1954]. Further, for every $N \ge 2$ we explicitly construct finite point sets $\{\boldsymbol{y}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_{N-1}\}$ in $[0,1)^s$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,N}(\{\boldsymbol{y}_0, \boldsymbol{y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_{N-1}\}) \le C_s N^{-1} (\log N)^{(s-1)/2}.$$

Another solution for finite point sets by a different construction was previously shown in [W. W. L. Chen and M. M. Skriganov, Explicit constructions in the classical mean squares problem in irregularity of point distribution. J. Reine Angew. Math., **545**, 67–95, 2002].

---

[*] The first author is supported by a Queen Elizabeth 2 Fellowship of the Australian Research Council.

[†] The second author is supported by the Austrian Research Foundation (FWF), Project S9609.

Keywords: $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy, explicit constructions, digital sequence, higher order sequence, digital higher order sequence, higher order net, higher order digital net

AMS Subject Classification: Primary: 11K38; Secondary: 11K06, 11K45, 65C05;

1 Introduction and Statement of the Main Results

We study equidistribution properties of point sets in the s-dimensional unit-cube $[0,1)^s$ measured by their $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy (see [2, 12, 13, 20, 24]). For a finite set $\mathcal{P}_{N,s} = \{\boldsymbol{x}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{N-1}\}$ of points in the s-dimensional unit-cube $[0,1)^s$ the local discrepancy function is defined as

$$\Delta(\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_s) = \frac{A_N([\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\omega}), \mathcal{P}_{N,s})}{N} - \omega_1 \cdots \omega_s,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\omega} = (\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_s) \in [0,1]^s$ and $A_N([\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\omega}), \mathcal{P}_{N,s})$ denotes the number of indices n with $\boldsymbol{x}_n \in [0, \omega_1) \times \cdots \times [0, \omega_s) =: [\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\omega})$. The discrepancy function measures the difference of the portion of points in an axis parallel box containing the origin and the volume of this box. Hence it is a measure of the irregularity of distribution of a point set in $[0,1)^s$.

The $\mathcal{L}_2$ *discrepancy* of $\mathcal{P}_{N,s}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,N}(P_{N,s}) = \left(\int_{[0,1]^s} |\Delta(\boldsymbol{\omega})|^2 \, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\omega} \right)^{1/2}. \tag{1}$$

For an infinite sequence $\mathcal{S}_s$ in $[0,1)^s$ the $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy $\mathcal{L}_{2,N}(\mathcal{S}_s)$ is the $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy of the first N elements of $\mathcal{S}_s$. It is well known that a sequence is uniformly distributed modulo one if and only if its $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy tends to zero for growing N. Furthermore, the $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy can also be linked to the integration error of a quasi-Monte Carlo rule, see, e.g. [12, 25, 36] for the error in the worst-case setting and [39] for the average case setting.

A lower bound on the $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy of *finite* point sets has been shown by Roth [32] which states that for any $s \in \mathbb{N}$ (the set of positive integers) there exists a number $c_s > 0$ depending only on s, such that for every point set $\mathcal{P}_{N,s}$ in $[0,1)^s$ consisting of $N \geq 2$ points we have

$$\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{P}_{N,s}) \geq c_s \frac{(\log N)^{(s-1)/2}}{N}. \tag{2}$$

This lower bound is best possible in the order of magnitude in N as shown first by Davenport [7] for $s = 2$ and then by Roth [33, 34] and Frolov [17] for arbitrary dimensions $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Davenport used point sets consisting of the $2N$ elements $(\{\pm n\alpha\}, n/N)$ for $1 \leq n \leq N$, where $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and α has a continued fraction expansion with bounded partial quotients. Further examples of two-dimensional point sets with best possible order of $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy can be found in [14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 30]. On the other hand, Roth's [34] proof for dimensions $s \geq 2$ is a pure existence result obtained by averaging arguments. Explicit constructions of point sets achieving the best possible order of convergence have been a longstanding open problem. Finally, a solution was given by Chen and Skriganov [4] who, for every integer $N \geq 2$ and every dimension $s \in \mathbb{N}$, gave for the first time explicit constructions of finite point sets consisting of N points in $[0,1)^s$ whose $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy achieves an order of convergence of $(\log N)^{(s-1)/2}/N$. Their construction uses a finite field $\mathbb{F}_p$ of order p with $p \geq 2s^2$. We also refer to [5] where the arguments from [4] are considerably simplified and to the overview in [12, Chapter 16]. The result in [4] was extended to the $\mathcal{L}_p$ discrepancy for $1 \leq p < \infty$ by Skriganov [35].

On the other hand, it was shown by Proinov [29] that for an infinite sequence $\mathcal{S}_s = (\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots)$ of points in $[0,1)^s$ there is a constant $c'_s > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,N}(\{\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{N-1}\}) \geq c'_s \frac{(\log N)^{s/2}}{N}$$

for infinitely many values of N. This lower bound is known to be best possible in dimension $s = 1$. One-dimensional infinite sequences whose $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy satisfy a bound of order $\sqrt{\log N}/N$ for every $N \geq 2$ were given in, e.g. [3, 18, 21, 29, 31]. These constructions are mainly based on the symmetrization of sequences (also called reflection principle). It is widely believed that Proinov's lower bound is also best possible for arbitrary dimensions s, which we show in this paper. The authors are not aware of any other construction which matches Proinov's lower bound.

1.1 The Main Results

In this paper we prove two main results: We provide explicit constructions of *infinite* sequences in $[0,1)^s$ for which the first $N \geq 2$ points achieve a $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy of order $(\log N)^{s/2}/N$ for arbitrary $s \in \mathbb{N}$. This result is best possible by the lower bound of Proinov [29].

Furthermore, for any integer $N \geq 2$ and any dimension $s \in \mathbb{N}$, we give an explicit construction of a finite point set of N elements in the s-dimensional unit cube with the optimal rate of convergence for the $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy in the sense of the lower bound of Roth. Our construction is completely different from the construction of Chen and Skriganov [4]. In contrast to [4] where the construction uses a finite field $\mathbb{F}_p$ with $p \geq 2s^2$ our method is, independent of the dimension s, based on the finite field $\mathbb{F}_2$ of order two. Furthermore, our result does not use the Davenport reflection principle [7] and also does not use the 'self-averaging' property from [4]. Instead it is based on higher order digital nets and sequences from [8, 9].

In our proofs we do not keep track of constants which depend only on the dimension s since they are significantly larger than the constants obtained in [11]. Therefore, in the following, we write $A(N,s) \ll_s B(N,s)$ if there is a constant $c_s > 0$ which depends only on s (and not on N or m through $N = 2^m$) such that $A(N,s) \leq c_s B(N,s)$.

Theorem 1 *For any $s \in \mathbb{N}$ one can explicitly construct an infinite sequence $\mathcal{S}_s = (\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, \ldots)$ of points in $[0,1)^s$ such that for all $N \geq 2$ we have*

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,N}(\{\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{N-1}\}) \ll_s \frac{(\log N)^{(s-1)/2}}{N} \sqrt{S(N)} \ll_s \frac{(\log N)^{s/2}}{N},$$

where $S(N)$ is the sum-of-digits function of N in base 2 representation, i.e. if $N = 2^{n_1} + 2^{n_2} + \cdots + 2^{n_r}$ with $n_1 > n_2 > \cdots > n_r \geq 0$, then $S(N) = r$. Obviously, we have $S(N) \leq 1 + (\log N)/(\log 2)$ for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

Remark 1 It follows from [22, Corollary 3] that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$\lim_{M \to \infty} \frac{1}{M} \left| \left\{ 0 \leq N < M \,:\, (1-\varepsilon)\frac{\log M}{2 \log 2} < S(N) < (1+\varepsilon)\frac{\log M}{2 \log 2} \right\} \right| = 1.$$

Hence the density of $N \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $S(N)$ is at least of order $\log N$ is equal to one. More precise results on the distribution of the sum-of-digits function can be obtained, e.g., from [1, 23].

The above construction can also be used to obtain the following result for finite point sets, which was first shown in [4] by a different construction.

Corollary 1 *For any $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and any integer $N \geq 2$ one can explicitly construct a point set $\mathcal{P}_{N,s}$ consisting of N elements in $[0,1)^s$ such that*

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,N}(\mathcal{P}_{N,s}) \ll_s \frac{(\log N)^{(s-1)/2}}{N}.$$

1.2 Explicit constructions of sequences and point sets

We now present explicit constructions of sequences and point sets satisfying Theorem 1 and Corollary 1.

The construction of sequences $\mathcal{S}_s = (\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots)$ in $[0,1)^s$ satisfying Theorem 1 was introduced in [8, 9] and is based on linear algebra over the finite field $\mathbb{F}_2$ of order 2 (we identify $\mathbb{F}_2$ with the set $\{0,1\}$ equipped with the arithmetic operations modulo 2).

Let $C_1, \ldots, C_s \in \mathbb{F}_2^{\mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{N}}$ be $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ matrices over $\mathbb{F}_2$. Let $n = n_0 + n_1 2 + \cdots + n_{m-1} 2^{m-1} \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be the binary expansion of n and set $\vec{n} = (n_0, n_1, \ldots, n_{m-1}, 0, 0, \ldots)^\top \in \mathbb{F}_2^{\mathbb{N}}$. Then define

$$\vec{x}_{j,n} = C_j \vec{n} \quad \text{for } j = 1, \ldots, s.$$

Let $\vec{x}_{j,n} = (x_{j,n,1}, x_{j,n,2}, \ldots)^\top$ and define

$$x_{j,n} = x_{j,n,1} 2^{-1} + x_{j,n,2} 2^{-2} + \cdots .$$

Then the nth point $\boldsymbol{x}_n$ of the sequence $\mathcal{S}_s$ is given by $\boldsymbol{x}_n = (x_{1,n}, \ldots, x_{s,n})$.

Explicit constructions of suitable generating matrices $C_1, \ldots, C_s$ where obtained by Sobol' [37], Niederreiter [26], Niederreiter-Xing [28] and others (see also [12, Chapter 8]). We briefly describe a special case of Sobol's and Niederreiter's construction of the generating matrices. Let $C_j = (c_{j,k,\ell})_{k,\ell \ge 1}$ with $c_{j,k,\ell} \in \mathbb{F}_2$. Let $p_1 = x$ and $p_i \in \mathbb{F}_2[x]$ be the $(i-1)$th primitive polynomial in a list of primitive polynomials over $\mathbb{F}_2$ that is sorted in increasing order according to their degree $e_j = \deg(p_j)$, that is, $e_1 \le e_2 \le \cdots \le e_s$ (the ordering of polynomials with the same degree is irrelevant). Consider the Laurent series expansion

$$\frac{x^{e_j - z - 1}}{p_j(x)^i} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} a_\ell(i,j,z) x^{-\ell} \in \mathbb{F}_2((x^{-1})).$$

Then for $1 \le j \le s$, $k, \ell \ge 1$ we define

$$c_{j,k,\ell} = a_\ell(i,j,z),$$

where $k - 1 = (i-1)e_j + z$ with integers v and i satisfying $0 \le z < e_j$.

Using the generating matrices defined this way, we obtain an infinite sequence $\mathcal{S}_s = (\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots)$ for any dimension $s \in \mathbb{N}$.

To obtain the sequence which satisfies Theorem 1 we need the following definition.

Definition 1 For $d \in \mathbb{N}$ the *digit interlacing composition* (with interlacing factor d) is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{D}_d : [0,1)^d &\to [0,1) \\ (x_1, \ldots, x_d) &\mapsto \sum_{a=1}^{\infty} \sum_{r=1}^{d} \xi_{r,a} 2^{-r-(a-1)d}, \end{aligned}$$

where $x_r = \xi_{r,1} 2^{-1} + \xi_{r,2} 2^{-2} + \cdots$ for $1 \le r \le d$. We also define this function for vectors by setting

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{D}_d : [0,1)^{ds} &\to [0,1)^s \\ (x_1, \ldots, x_{ds}) &\mapsto (\mathscr{D}_d(x_1, \ldots, x_d), \ldots, \mathscr{D}_d(x_{(s-1)d+1}, \ldots, x_{sd})), \end{aligned}$$

for point sets $\mathcal{P}_{N,sd} = \{\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{N-1}\} \subseteq [0,1)^{sd}$ by

$$\mathscr{D}_d(\mathcal{P}_{N,sd}) = \{\mathscr{D}_d(\boldsymbol{x}_0), \mathscr{D}_d(\boldsymbol{x}_1), \ldots, \mathscr{D}_d(\boldsymbol{x}_{N-1})\} \subseteq [0,1)^s$$

and sequences $\mathcal{S}_{sd} = (\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots)$ with $\boldsymbol{x}_n \in [0,1)^{sd}$ by

$$\mathscr{D}_d(\mathcal{S}_{sd}) = (\mathscr{D}_d(\boldsymbol{x}_0), \mathscr{D}_d(\boldsymbol{x}_1), \ldots).$$

Then the sequence $\mathscr{D}_5(\mathcal{S}_{5s})$ satisfies the bounds in Theorem 1. More generally, any sequence $\mathscr{D}_d(\mathcal{S}_{ds})$ with $d \ge 5$ satisfies the bound.

Note that the interlacing can also be applied to the generating matrices $C_1, \ldots, C_s$ directly as described in [9, Section 4.4], thus one can obtain generating matrices $E_1, \ldots, E_s \in \mathbb{F}_2^{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}}$ which generate a digital sequence satisfying Theorem 1.

To construct finite point sets for any integer $N \ge 2$ we proceed the following way. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $N \le 2^m$ and let $\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{2^m-1} \in [0,1]^{3s-1}$ be the first 2^m points from the Sobol or Niederreiter sequence in dimension $3s-1$ as introduced above with $p_1 = x$ and $p_2 = 1+x$. Let $\boldsymbol{x}_n = (x_{1,n}, \ldots, x_{3s-1,n})$ and define $\boldsymbol{y}_n = (n2^{-m}, x_{1,n}, \ldots, x_{3s-1,n}) \in [0,1)^{3s}$. Let now $\mathcal{P}_{2^m,s} = \{\mathscr{D}_3(\boldsymbol{y}_0), \mathscr{D}_3(\boldsymbol{y}_1), \ldots, \mathscr{D}_3(\boldsymbol{y}_{2^m})\}$. To obtain a point set consisting of N points we use a propagation rule introduced in [4] (see also [12, p. 512]): The subset

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{N,s} := \mathcal{P}_{2^m,s} \cap \left(\left[0, \frac{N}{2^m}\right) \times [0,1)^{s-1} \right)$$

contains exactly N points. Then we define the point set

$$\mathcal{P}_{N,s} := \left\{ \left(\frac{2^m}{N} x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_s \right) \,:\, (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_s) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{N,s} \right\}. \tag{3}$$

Then $\mathcal{P}_{N,s}$ satisfies the bound in Corollary 1. We remark that Chen and Skriganov [4] applied the same propagation rule but to a different point set.

1.3 The general construction principle

The constructions of [8, 9] were introduced to obtain explicit examples of so-called higher order digital sequences. In fact, our proof shows that any higher order digital sequence [9, Definition 4.3 and Definition 4.8] of order at least 5 satisfies Theorem 1. We state simplified versions of these definitions here which are sufficient for our purpose.

Definition 2 Let $m, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and let t be an integer such that $0 \le t \le \alpha m$. Let $C_1, \ldots, C_s \in \mathbb{F}_2^{m \times m}$ with $C_j = (\vec{c}_{j,1}, \ldots, \vec{c}_{j,m})^\top$, i.e., $\vec{c}_{j,i} \in \mathbb{F}_2^m$ is the ith row vector of the matrix C_j. If for all $1 \le i_{j,\nu_j} < \cdots < i_{j,1} \le m$ with

$$\sum_{j=1}^{s} \sum_{l=1}^{\min(\nu_j,\alpha)} i_{j,l} \le \alpha m - t$$

the vectors

$$\vec{c}_{1,i_{1,\nu_1}}, \ldots, \vec{c}_{1,i_{1,1}}, \ldots, \vec{c}_{s,i_{s,\nu_s}}, \ldots, \vec{c}_{s,i_{s,1}}$$

are linearly independent over $\mathbb{F}_2$, then the digital net with generating matrices $C_1, \ldots, C_s$ is called an *order α digital (t, m, s)-net over* $\mathbb{F}_2$.

Definition 3 Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $t \ge 0$ be an integer. Let $C_1, \ldots, C_s \in \mathbb{F}_2^{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}}$ and let $C_{j,m\times m}$ denote the left upper $m \times m$ submatrix of C_j. If for all $m > t$ the matrices $C_{1,m\times m}, \ldots, C_{s,m\times m}$ generate an order α digital (t, m, s)-net over $\mathbb{F}_2$, then the digital sequence with generating matrices $C_1, \ldots, C_s$ is called an *order α digital (t, s)-sequence over* $\mathbb{F}_2$.

It follows from the results in [8, Theorem 4.11 and Theorem 4.12] for the finite field $\mathbb{F}_2$ that the sequence $\mathscr{D}_d(\mathcal{S}_{ds})$ is an order d digital (t, s)-sequence (which shows that t is independent of m).

The proof of Theorem 1 shows that every order α digital (t, s)-sequence over $\mathbb{F}_2$ with $\alpha \ge 5$ satisfies Theorem 1. We conjecture that $\alpha \ge 2$ is sufficient.

2 Walsh series representation of the squared $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy

2.1 Walsh functions

We introduce Walsh functions in base 2 (see [6, 38]), which will be the main tool in our analysis of the $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy. In the following let $\mathbb{N}_0$ denote the set of non-negative integers. For $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with base 2 representation

$$k = \kappa_{a-1} 2^{a-1} + \cdots + \kappa_1 2 + \kappa_0,$$

with $\kappa_i \in \{0, 1\}$, we define the Walsh function $\mathrm{wal}_k : [0,1) \to \{-1, 1\}$ by

$$\mathrm{wal}_k(x) := (-1)^{x_1 \kappa_0 + \cdots + x_a \kappa_{a-1}},$$

for $x \in [0,1)$ with base 2 representation $x = \frac{x_1}{2} + \frac{x_2}{2^2} + \cdots$ (unique in the sense that infinitely many of the x_i must be zero).

For dimension $s \geq 2$, $x_1, \ldots, x_s \in [0,1)$ and $k_1, \ldots, k_s \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we define $\mathrm{wal}_{k_1,\ldots,k_s} : [0,1)^s \to \{-1, 1\}$ by

$$\mathrm{wal}_{k_1,\ldots,k_s}(x_1, \ldots, x_s) := \prod_{j=1}^{s} \mathrm{wal}_{k_j}(x_j).$$

For vectors $\boldsymbol{k} = (k_1, \ldots, k_s) \in \mathbb{N}_0^s$ and $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_s) \in [0,1)^s$ we write

$$\mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}) := \mathrm{wal}_{k_1,\ldots,k_s}(x_1, \ldots, x_s).$$

Further properties of Walsh functions can be found in [12, Appendix A].

We introduce some notation. By $\oplus$ we denote the digit-wise addition modulo 2 , i.e., for $x = \sum_{i=w}^{\infty} \frac{x_i}{2^i}$ and $y = \sum_{i=w}^{\infty} \frac{y_i}{2^i}$ we put

$$x \oplus y := \sum_{i=w}^{\infty} \frac{z_i}{2^i}, \quad \text{where} \quad z_i := x_i + y_i \pmod{2}.$$

Further we call $x \in [0,1)$ a dyadic rational if it can be written in a finite base 2 expansion. For vectors $\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in [0,1)^s$ we set $\boldsymbol{x} \oplus \boldsymbol{y} = (x_1 \oplus y_1, \ldots, x_s \oplus y_s)$.

Let $\{\boldsymbol{x}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{2^m-1}\}$ in $[0,1)^s$ be a digital net over $\mathbb{F}_2$ and let $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in [0,1)^s$. Then we call the point set $\{\boldsymbol{x}_0 \oplus \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{2^m-1} \oplus \boldsymbol{\sigma}\}$ a *digitally shifted digital net over* $\mathbb{F}_2$.

2.2 The Walsh series expansion of the $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy

The squared $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy of a point set $\mathcal{P}_{N,s} = \{\boldsymbol{x}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{N-1}\}$ can be viewed as a function of $\{\boldsymbol{x}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{N-1}\}$, i.e. a function of Ns variables:

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,N}^2(\mathcal{P}_{N,s}) = \mathcal{L}_{2,N}^2(\{\boldsymbol{x}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{N-1}\}).$$

In the following we give the Walsh series expansion of the function $\mathcal{L}_{2,N}^2$.

There is a well known formula for the $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy of a point set by Warnock (see, for example, [12, Proposition 2.15]), which we use in the following to obtain the Walsh series expansion of $\mathcal{L}_{2,N}(\mathcal{P}_{N,s})$. This formula is given in the following proposition.

Proposition 1 *Let $\mathcal{P}_{N,s} = \{\boldsymbol{x}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{N-1}\}$ be a point set in $[0,1)^s$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{L}_{2,N}^2(\mathcal{P}_{N,s}) \\ &\quad = \frac{1}{3^s} - \frac{2}{N}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\prod_{j=1}^{s}\frac{1-x_{n,j}^2}{2} + \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{n,m=0}^{N-1}\prod_{j=1}^{s}\min(1-x_{n,j}, 1-x_{m,j}), \end{aligned}$$

where $x_{n,j}$ is the j-th component of the point $\boldsymbol{x}_n$.

The following result deals with the Walsh series expansion of the indicator function $1_{[0,\omega)}(x)$ (which is 1 for $0 \le x < \omega$ and 0 otherwise) and is a consequence of [21, Lemma 2 and Lemma 3] (see also [12, Proof of Lemma 3.29]).

Here and in the following let $k > 0$ have base 2 representation $k = \kappa_0 + \kappa_1 2 + \cdots + \kappa_{a-2}2^{a-2} + 2^{a-1}$ with $\kappa_i \in \{0,1\}$. We define the weight function

$$\mu(k) = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } k > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } k = 0. \end{cases}$$

For any $0 \le x \le 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^1 1_{[0,\omega)}(x)\mathrm{wal}_k(\omega)\,\mathrm{d}\omega \\ &\quad = -\mathrm{wal}_k(x)\frac{2}{2^{\mu(k)}}\left(\frac{1}{2^2}\mathrm{wal}_{2^{\mu(k)-1}}(x) - \sum_{r=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{2^{r+2}}\mathrm{wal}_{2^{r+\mu(k)-1}}(x)\right) \\ &\quad = \frac{1}{2^{\mu(k)+1}}\left(\sum_{r=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{2^r}\mathrm{wal}_{k+2^{r+\mu(k)-1}}(x) - \mathrm{wal}_{k\oplus 2^{\mu(k)-1}}(x)\right). \end{aligned}$$

As the above formula gives the k-th Walsh coefficient of $1_{[0,\omega)}(x)$ as a function of ω we obtain the Walsh series expansion

$$\begin{aligned}1_{[0,\omega)}(x) \;\simeq\; & 1-x \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{\mu(k)+1}} \left(\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^r} \mathrm{wal}_{k+2^{r+\mu(k)-1}}(x) - \mathrm{wal}_{k \oplus 2^{\mu(k)-1}}(x) \right) \mathrm{wal}_k(\omega).\end{aligned}$$

The well-known Parseval identity yields the equality

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^1 1_{[0,\omega)}(x) 1_{[0,\omega)}(y) \, \mathrm{d}\omega \\ &= (1-x)(1-y) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{2\mu(k)+2}} \left(\mathrm{wal}_{k \oplus 2^{\mu(k)-1}}(x) - \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^r} \mathrm{wal}_{k+2^{r+\mu(k)-1}}(x) \right) \\ &\qquad \times \left(\mathrm{wal}_{k \oplus 2^{\mu(k)-1}}(y) - \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^r} \mathrm{wal}_{k+2^{r+\mu(k)-1}}(y) \right).\end{aligned}$$

Now we consider the $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy of a point set $\mathcal{P}_{N,s} = \{\boldsymbol{x}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{N-1}\}$ in $[0,1)^s$. Using the fact that $A_N([\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{\omega}), \mathcal{P}_{N,s}) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^{s} 1_{[0,\omega_j)}(x_{n,j})$ it follows that

$$\int_{[0,1]^s} \left(\frac{A_N([\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{\omega}), \mathcal{P}_{N,s})}{N} \right)^2 \, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\omega} \;=\; \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{n,m=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^{s} \int_0^1 1_{[0,\omega_j)}(x_{n,j}) 1_{[0,\omega_j)}(x_{m,j}) \, \mathrm{d}\omega_j.$$

Combining the last two equations we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{[0,1]^s} \left(\frac{A_N([\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{\omega}), \mathcal{P}_{N,s})}{N} \right)^2 \, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\omega} \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{n,m=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^{s} \Bigg[(1-x_{n,j})(1-x_{m,j}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{2\mu(k)+2}} \left(\mathrm{wal}_{k \oplus 2^{\mu(k)-1}}(x_{n,j}) - \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^r} \mathrm{wal}_{k+2^{r+\mu(k)-1}}(x_{n,j}) \right) \\ &\qquad \times \left(\mathrm{wal}_{k \oplus 2^{\mu(k)-1}}(x_{m,j}) - \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^r} \mathrm{wal}_{k+2^{r+\mu(k)-1}}(x_{m,j}) \right) \Bigg]. \qquad (4)\end{aligned}$$

Note that we have $\int_{[0,1]^s} \left(\frac{A_N([\mathbf{0},\boldsymbol{\omega}),\mathcal{P}_{N,s})}{N}\right)^2 \,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\omega} = \sum_{n,m=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^s \min(1-x_{n,j}, 1-x_{m,j})$, which follows from the proof of Warnock's formula for the $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy.

The Walsh series representation of $(1-x_{n,j})(1-x_{m,j})$ can easily be found. For example it was shown in [12, Lemma A.22] that

$$x - \frac{1}{2} = -\sum_{a=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{a+1}} \mathrm{wal}_{2^{a-1}}(x). \tag{5}$$

Using (4) together with the last equality we obtain the Walsh series representation of $\int_{[0,1]^s} \left(\frac{A_N([\mathbf{0},\boldsymbol{\omega}),\mathcal{P}_{N,s})}{N}\right)^2 \,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\omega}$.

Using again (5) and Proposition 1 we can now obtain the Walsh series expansion of the squared $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy, which is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{L}_{2,N}^2(\mathcal{P}_{N,s}) \\
&\quad= \frac{1}{3^s} - \frac{2}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^{s} \left(\frac{1}{3} + \sum_{a=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{a+2}} \mathrm{wal}_{2^{a-1}}(x_{n,j}) \right. \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \left. - \sum_{1 \le a < a'} \frac{1}{2^{a+a'+2}} \mathrm{wal}_{2^{a-1}+2^{a'-1}}(x_{n,j}) \right) \\
&\qquad + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{n,m=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^{s} \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} + \sum_{a=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{a+1}} \mathrm{wal}_{2^{a-1}}(x_{n,j}) \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} + \sum_{a=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{a+1}} \mathrm{wal}_{2^{a-1}}(x_{m,j}) \right) \right. \\
&\qquad\qquad + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{2\mu(k)+2}} \left(\mathrm{wal}_{k \oplus 2^{\mu(k)-1}}(x_{n,j}) - \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^r} \mathrm{wal}_{k+2^{r+\mu(k)-1}}(x_{n,j}) \right) \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad \left. \times \left(\mathrm{wal}_{k \oplus 2^{\mu(k)-1}}(x_{m,j}) - \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^r} \mathrm{wal}_{k+2^{r+\mu(k)-1}}(x_{m,j}) \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The following lemma can now be obtained upon comparing coefficients.

Lemma 1 *For any* $\mathcal{P}_{N,s} = \{\boldsymbol{x}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{N-1}\}$ *in* $[0,1)^s$ *we obtain*

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,N}^2(\mathcal{P}_{N,s}) = \frac{1}{3^s} - \frac{2}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s} r(\boldsymbol{k}, \mathbf{0}) \mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}_n)$$

$$+\frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{n,m=0}^{N-1}\sum_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}\in\mathbb{N}_0^s} r(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l})\mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}_n)\mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{l}}(\boldsymbol{x}_m),$$

where $\boldsymbol{k}=(k_1,\ldots,k_s)$*,* $\boldsymbol{l}=(l_1,\ldots,l_s)$*,* $r(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l})=\prod_{j=1}^s r(k_j,l_j)$*. Further we have* $r(k,l)=r(l,k)$ *and for non-negative integers* $0\le l\le k$ *with* $k=2^{a_1-1}+\cdots+2^{a_v-1}$ *with* $a_1>\cdots>a_v>0$ *and* $l=2^{b_1-1}+\cdots+2^{b_w-1}$ *with* $b_1>\cdots>b_v>0$ *we have*

$$r(k,l)=\begin{cases}\frac{1}{3} & \textit{if } k=l=0,\\ \frac{1}{2^{a_1+2}} & \textit{if } v=1 \textit{ and } l=0,\\ -\frac{1}{2^{a_1+a_2+2}} & \textit{if } v=2 \textit{ and } l=0,\\ -\frac{1}{2^{a_1+a_2+2}} & \textit{if } v=w+2>2 \textit{ and } a_3=b_1,\ldots,a_v=b_{v-2},\\ \frac{1}{3\cdot 4^{a_1}} & \textit{if } k=l>0,\\ \frac{1}{2^{a_1+b_1+2}} & \textit{if } v=w, a_1\neq b_1 \textit{ and } a_2=b_2,\ldots,a_v=b_v,\\ 0 & \textit{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

The above formula can be simplified further.

Lemma 2 *The squared* $\mathcal{L}_2$ *discrepancy of a point set* $\mathcal{P}_{N,s}=\{\boldsymbol{x}_0,\ldots,\boldsymbol{x}_{N-1}\}$ *in* $[0,1)^s$ *can be written as*

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,N}^2(\mathcal{P}_{N,s})=\sum_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}\in\mathbb{N}_0^s\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}} r(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l})\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}_n)\frac{1}{N}\sum_{m=0}^{N-1}\mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{l}}(\boldsymbol{x}_m),$$

where the coefficients $r(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l})$ *are given as in Lemma 1.*

If $\mathcal{P}_{2^m,s}$ *is a digital net over* $\mathbb{F}_2$ *we have*

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,2^m}^2(\mathcal{P}_{2^m,s})=\sum_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}\in\mathcal{D}^*} r(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}),$$

where $\mathcal{D}^*=\mathcal{D}\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}$ *and where* $\mathcal{D}$ *is the so-called dual net given by*

$$\mathcal{D}=\{(k_1,\ldots,s)\in\mathbb{N}_0^s\,:\,C_1^\top\vec{k}_1+\cdots+C_s^\top\vec{k}_s=\vec{0}\},$$

where for $k\in\mathbb{N}_0^s$ *with base 2 expansion* $k=\kappa_0+\kappa_1 2+\kappa_2 2^2+\cdots$ *we put* $\vec{k}=(\kappa_0,\ldots,\kappa_{m-1})^\top$*.*

If $\mathcal{P}_{2^m,s}$ *is a digital net over* $\mathbb{F}_2$ *digitally shifted by* $\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in[0,1)^s$ *we have*

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,2^m}^2(\mathcal{P}_{2^m,s})=\sum_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}\in\mathcal{D}^*} r(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l})\mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{l}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}),$$

where $\mathcal{D}^*$ *denotes the dual net excluding* $\boldsymbol{0}$*.*

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{2,N}^2(\mathcal{P}_{N,s}) &= \frac{1}{3^s} - \frac{2}{N}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\sum_{\boldsymbol{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^s} r(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{0})\mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}_n) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{n,m=0}^{N-1}\sum_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}\in\mathbb{N}_0^s} r(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l})\mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}_n)\mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{l}}(\boldsymbol{x}_m) \\ &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}\in\mathbb{N}_0^s\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}} r(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l})\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}_n)\frac{1}{N}\sum_{m=0}^{N-1}\mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{l}}(\boldsymbol{x}_m)\end{aligned}$$

from which the first part follows. The second part follows immediately from the character property of digital nets and the above equality. The third part follows in the same manner as the second part using the additional equality $\mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}\oplus\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = \mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x})\mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$. □

3 The proof of Theorem 1

We give the proof of our main result.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S}_s = (\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots)$ in $[0,1)^s$ be an order α digital sequence over $\mathbb{F}_2$ with $\alpha \ge 5$. By [9, Theorem 3.3 (iii)] it follows that the sequence is an order α' digital $(t(\alpha'), s)$-sequence over $\mathbb{F}_2$ for $1 \le \alpha' \le \alpha$. Let $t = \max\{t(1), t(2), t(3), t(4), t(5)\}$, that is, the sequence is an order α' digital (t,s) sequence over $\mathbb{F}_2$ for all $1 \le \alpha' \le 5$. Note that the sequence explicitly constructed in Section 1.2 is an order 5 digital (t,s)-sequence over $\mathbb{F}_2$ and therefore the proof applies to this case. Further note that the first 2^m points of this sequence are an order α' digital (t,m,s)-net over $\mathbb{F}_2$ for $1 \le \alpha' \le 5$ by Definition 3.

We use the first part of Lemma 2 to obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,N}^2(\mathcal{S}_s) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}\in\mathbb{N}_0^s\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}} r(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l})\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}_n)\frac{1}{N}\sum_{m=0}^{N-1}\mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{l}}(\boldsymbol{x}_m).$$

Let $N = 2^{m_1} + 2^{m_2} + \cdots + 2^{m_r}$ with $m_1 > m_2 > \cdots > m_r \ge 0$ (hence $r = S(N)$). Then the points

$$\boldsymbol{x}_{2^{m_1}+\cdots+2^{m_{i-1}}}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{-1+2^{m_1}+\cdots+2^{m_i}},$$

where for $i = 1$ we define $2^{m_1} + \cdots + 2^{m_{i-1}} = 0$, are a digitally shifted order α' digital (t, m_i, s)-net over $\mathbb{F}_2$ for $1 \le \alpha' \le 5$ (see Definition 3 and [12, Section 4.4.6]). The generating matrices $C_{1,m_i \times m_i}, \ldots, C_{s,m_i \times m_i}$ of this digital net are the left upper $m_i \times m_i$ submatrices of the generating matrices $C_1, \ldots, C_s$ of the digital sequence. Assume that the digital shift is given by $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i$. Let $\mathcal{D}_i$ denote the dual net corresponding to this digital net, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{D}_i = \{\boldsymbol{k} = (k_1, \ldots, k_s) \in \mathbb{N}_0^s \,:\, C_{1,m_i \times m_i}^\top \vec{k}_1 + \cdots + C_{s,m_i \times m_i}^\top \vec{k}_s = \vec{0}\},$$

where for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with base 2 expansion $k = \kappa_0 + \kappa_1 2 + \kappa_2 2^2 + \cdots$ we set $\vec{k} = (\kappa_0, \kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_{m_i - 1})^\top$. Set $\mathcal{D}_i^* = \mathcal{D}_i \setminus \{\boldsymbol{0}\}$. Then we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{2^{m_i}}{N} \frac{1}{2^{m_i}} \sum_{n=2^{m_1}+\cdots+2^{m_{i-1}}}^{-1+2^{m_1}+\cdots+2^{m_i}} \mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}_n),$$

where again for $i = 1$ we set $2^{m_1} + \cdots + 2^{m_{i-1}} = 0$, and by [12, Lemma 4.75]

$$\frac{1}{2^{m_i}} \sum_{n=2^{m_1}+\cdots+2^{m_{i-1}}}^{-1+2^{m_1}+\cdots+2^{m_i}} \mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}_n) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i) & \text{if } \boldsymbol{k} \in \mathcal{D}_i, \\ 0 & \text{if } \boldsymbol{k} \notin \mathcal{D}_i. \end{cases}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{2,N}^2(\mathcal{S}_s) &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s \setminus \{\boldsymbol{0}\}} r(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}_n) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{l}}(\boldsymbol{x}_m) \\ &= \sum_{i,i'=1}^{r} \frac{2^{m_i}}{N} \frac{2^{m_{i'}}}{N} \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathcal{D}_i^*, \boldsymbol{l} \in \mathcal{D}_{i'}^*} r(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}) \mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i) \mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{l}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{i'}) \\ &\le \sum_{i,i'=1}^{r} \frac{2^{m_i}}{N} \frac{2^{m_{i'}}}{N} \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathcal{D}_i^*, \boldsymbol{l} \in \mathcal{D}_{i'}^*} |r(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l})|. \end{aligned}$$

We introduce some notation. Let

$$\mathcal{J}_{i,i'} = \{(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}) \in \mathcal{D}_i^* \times \mathcal{D}_{i'}^* : r(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}) \neq 0\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{J}_{i,i'}(z) = \{(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}) \in \mathcal{J}_{i,i'} : \mu(\boldsymbol{k}) + \mu(\boldsymbol{l}) = z\}.$$

Recall that the function $\mu : \mathbb{N}_0 \to \mathbb{N}_0$ is defined by $\mu(0) = 0$ and for $k = \kappa_0 + \kappa_1 2 + \cdots + \kappa_{a-2} 2^{a-2} + 2^{a-1}$ with $\kappa_j \in \{0,1\}$ by $\mu(k) = a$.

For $(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}) \in \mathcal{J}_{i,i'}$ we have

$$|r(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l})| \leq \frac{1}{3^s 2^{\mu(\boldsymbol{k})+\mu(\boldsymbol{l})}}.$$

Thus we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,N}^2(\mathcal{S}_s) \ll_s \sum_{i,i'=1}^{r} \frac{2^{m_i}}{N}\frac{2^{m_{i'}}}{N} \sum_{(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l})\in\mathcal{J}_{i,i'}} \frac{1}{2^{\mu(\boldsymbol{k})+\mu(\boldsymbol{l})}}.$$

It follows from $\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathcal{D}_i^*$ that $\mu(\boldsymbol{k}) > m_i - t$ and from $\boldsymbol{l} \in \mathcal{D}_{i'}^*$ it follows also that $\mu(\boldsymbol{l}) > m_{i'} - t$ and hence $\mu(\boldsymbol{k}) + \mu(\boldsymbol{l}) \geq m_i + m_{i'} - 2t + 2$.

Thus we have

$$\sum_{(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l})\in\mathcal{J}_{i,i'}} \frac{1}{2^{\mu(\boldsymbol{k})+\mu(\boldsymbol{l})}} = \sum_{z=m_i+m_{i'}-2t+2}^{\infty} \frac{|\mathcal{J}_{i,i'}(z)|}{2^z}.$$

Let $k_j, l_j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. In the following we simultaneously use two different notations for the binary expansion of k_j and l_j. First let

$$k_j = 2^{a_{j,1}-1} + \cdots + 2^{a_{j,\widetilde{v}_j}-1}$$

with $a_{j,1} > \cdots > a_{j,\widetilde{v}_j} > 0$ and

$$l_j = 2^{b_{j,1}-1} + \cdots + 2^{b_{j,\widetilde{w}_j}-1}$$

with $b_{j,1} > \cdots > b_{j,\widetilde{w}_j} > 0$. Thus $\widetilde{v}_j$ denotes the number of nonzero digits of k_j and $\widetilde{w}_j$ denotes the number of nonzero digits of l_j. For $k_j = 0$ we use the convention that $\widetilde{v}_j = 0$ and $a_{j,1} = 0$. Further we set $a_{j,\widetilde{v}_j+i} = b_{j,\widetilde{w}_j+i} = 0$ for $i > 0$.

Further we also use the notation

$$k_j = k_{j,0} + k_{j,1}2 + \cdots + k_{j,a_{j,1}-1}2^{a_{j,1}-1}$$

with binary digits $k_{j,i} \in \{0,1\}$. Thus

$$k_{j,i} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = a_{j,v} \text{ for some } 1 \leq v \leq \widetilde{v}_j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Analogously we write

$$l_j = l_{j,0} + l_{j,1}2 + \cdots + l_{j,b_{j,1}-1}2^{b_{j,1}-1}$$

with binary digits $l_{j,i} \in \{0,1\}$. Thus

$$l_{j,i} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = b_{j,w} \text{ for some } 1 \le w \le \widetilde{w}_j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Recall that $r(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}) = \prod_{j=1}^{s} r(k_j,l_j)$. For $r(k_j,l_j) \neq 0$ it follows that in some sense k_j and l_j cannot be too different. Let us elaborate in more detail: Assume that $r(k_j,l_j) \neq 0$. Now Lemma 1 implies that in order for $r(k_j,l_j)$ not to be 0 we must have $0 \le |\widetilde{v}_j - \widetilde{w}_j| \le 2$. Further we must have:

$$\begin{array}{lll} (i) & |\widetilde{v}_j - \widetilde{w}_j| = 0 \;\Rightarrow & a_{j,2} = b_{j,2}, \ldots, a_{j,\widetilde{v}_j} = b_{j,\widetilde{v}_j}, \\ (ii) & |\widetilde{v}_j - \widetilde{w}_j| = 1 \;\Rightarrow & k_j = 0 \text{ or } l_j = 0, \\ (iii) & |\widetilde{v}_j - \widetilde{w}_j| = 2 \;\Rightarrow & \text{if } \widetilde{v}_j = \widetilde{w}_j + 2 \text{ then } a_{j,3} = b_{j,1}, \ldots, a_{j,\widetilde{v}_j} = b_{j,\widetilde{w}_j} \\ & & \text{if } \widetilde{w}_j = \widetilde{v}_j + 2 \text{ then } b_{j,3} = a_{j,1}, \ldots, b_{j,\widetilde{w}_j} = a_{j,\widetilde{v}_j}. \end{array}$$

If $|\widetilde{v}_j - \widetilde{w}_j| > 2$ we always have $r(k_j,l_j) = 0$.

For given $(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}) \in \mathcal{J}_{i,i'}(z)$ we define the following sets for $-2 \le \tau \le 2$:

$$\alpha_\tau = \{j \in \{1,\ldots,s\} \,:\, \widetilde{v}_j = \widetilde{w}_j + \tau\}.$$

Note that $\alpha_\tau \cap \alpha_{\tau'} = \emptyset$ for $\tau \neq \tau'$ and $\bigcup_{\tau=-2}^{2} \alpha_\tau = \{1,\ldots,s\}$ by Lemma 1. Then we have

1. For $j \in \alpha_2$ we have $l_{j,i} = k_{j,i}$ for $0 \le i < a_{j,2} - 1$;
2. For $j \in \alpha_1$ we have $l_j = 0$ and $k_j = 2^{a_{j,1}-1}$;
3. For $j \in \alpha_0$ we have $k_{j,i} = l_{j,i}$ for $0 \le i < \min\{a_{j,1}, b_{j,1}\} - 1$;
4. For $j \in \alpha_{-1}$ we have $l_j = 2^{b_{j,1}-1}$ and $k_j = 0$;
5. For $j \in \alpha_{-2}$ we have $l_{j,i} = k_{j,i}$ for $0 \le i < b_{j,2} - 1$.

Thus in all cases we have $k_{j,i} = l_{j,i}$ for $0 \le i < \min\{a_{j,2} - 1, b_{j,2} - 1\}$. We set now

$$h_{j,i} = k_{j,i} = l_{j,i} \quad \text{for all } 1 \le j \le s \text{ and } 0 \le i < \min\{a_{j,2} - 1, b_{j,2} - 1\},$$

and for $u_j = \min\{a_{j,2} - 1, b_{j,2} - 1\}$ we set

$$h_j = h_{j,0} + h_{j,1} 2 + \cdots + h_{j,u_j - 1} 2^{u_j - 1} \quad \text{for } 1 \le j \le s$$

if $u_j \geq 0$ and $h_j = 0$ otherwise. Thus we only need to consider the cases where

$$\begin{aligned} k_j &= h_j + \lfloor 2^{a_{j,2}-1} \rfloor + \lfloor 2^{a_{j,1}-1} \rfloor, \\ l_j &= h_j + \lfloor 2^{b_{j,2}-1} \rfloor + \lfloor 2^{b_{j,1}-1} \rfloor \end{aligned}$$

for $1 \leq j \leq s$.

We now study the number of elements in the set $\mathcal{J}_{i,i'}(z)$. Assume that $i \leq i'$. Assume that $(\boldsymbol{k}, \boldsymbol{l}) \in \mathcal{J}_{i,i'}(z)$, $z = z_1 + z_2$ with $\mu(\boldsymbol{k}) = z_1$ and $\mu(\boldsymbol{l}) = z_2$. Let

$$R(\boldsymbol{k}, z_2) = \{\boldsymbol{l} \in \mathcal{D}^*_{i'} \,:\, (\boldsymbol{k}, \boldsymbol{l}) \in \mathcal{J}_{i,i'}(z), \mu(\boldsymbol{l}) = z_2\}.$$

If $\mu(\boldsymbol{k}) \leq m_i - t$ or $z_2 \leq m_{i'} - t$ then $R(\boldsymbol{k}, z_2) = \emptyset$, thus we only need to consider the case where $\mu(\boldsymbol{k}) > m_i - t$ and $z_2 > m_{i'} - t$. Thus $z = z_1 + z_2 \geq m_i + m_{i'} - 2t + 2$. We have

$$|\mathcal{J}_{i,i'}(z)| \leq \sum_{z_1 = m_i - t + 1}^{z - m_{i'} + t - 1} |\{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathcal{D}^*_i \,:\, \mu(\boldsymbol{k}) = z_1\}| \max_{\substack{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathcal{D}^*_i \\ \mu(\boldsymbol{k}) = z_1}} |R(\boldsymbol{k}, z - z_1)|. \tag{6}$$

We now study the two factors from the above sum separately in two steps:

Step I The number of $\boldsymbol{k} = (k_1, \ldots, k_s) \in \mathcal{D}^*_i$ with $\mu(\boldsymbol{k}) = z_1$ has been studied in [11]. Assume first that $k_j > 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq s$. The case where one or more of the k_j's are zero follows by the same arguments. Let $\Sigma(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s)$ denote the number of such $\boldsymbol{k} = (k_1, \ldots, k_s) \in \mathcal{D}^*_i$ with $\mu(k_j) = a_{j,1} = v_j$. Then $\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathcal{D}^*_i$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\vec{c}_{1,1} h_{1,0} + \cdots + \vec{c}_{1,a_{1,2}-1} h_{1,a_{1,2}-2} + \vec{c}_{1,a_{1,2}} + \vec{c}_{1,a_{1,1}} + \\ &\vec{c}_{2,1} h_{2,0} + \cdots + \vec{c}_{2,a_{2,2}-1} h_{2,a_{2,2}-2} + \vec{c}_{2,a_{2,2}} + \vec{c}_{2,a_{2,1}} + \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \vdots \\ &\vec{c}_{s,1} h_{s,0} + \cdots + \vec{c}_{s,a_{s,2}-1} h_{s,a_{s,2}-2} + \vec{c}_{s,a_{s,2}} + \vec{c}_{s,a_{s,1}} \quad = \quad \vec{0}, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\vec{c}_{j,i} \in \mathbb{F}_2^{m_i}$ denotes the ith row vector of the matrix $C_{j, m_i \times m_i}$. Since by the digital (t, m_i, s)-net property the vectors

$$\vec{c}_{1,1}, \ldots, \vec{c}_{1,v_1}, \ldots, \vec{c}_{s,1}, \ldots, \vec{c}_{s,v_s}$$

are linearly independent as long as $v_1 + \cdots + v_s \leq m_i - t$, we must have

$$v_1 + \cdots + v_s \geq m_i - t + 1. \tag{8}$$

Let now A denote the $m_i \times ((v_1-1)+\cdots+(v_s-1))$ matrix with column vectors $\vec{c}_{1,1}^{\top}, \ldots, \vec{c}_{1,v_1-1}^{\top}, \ldots, \vec{c}_{s,1}^{\top}, \ldots, \vec{c}_{s,v_s-1}^{\top}$, i.e.,

$$A := (\vec{c}_{1,1}^{\top}, \ldots, \vec{c}_{1,v_1-1}^{\top}, \ldots, \vec{c}_{s,1}^{\top}, \ldots, \vec{c}_{s,v_s-1}^{\top}).$$

Further let

$$\vec{f} := \vec{c}_{1,v_1}^{\top} + \cdots + \vec{c}_{s,v_s}^{\top} \in \mathbb{F}_2^{m_i}$$

and

$$\vec{k} := (k_{1,0}, \ldots, k_{1,v_1-2}, \ldots, k_{s,0}, \ldots, k_{s,v_s-2})^{\top} \in \mathbb{F}_2^{(v_1-1)+\cdots+(v_s-1)}.$$

Then the linear system of equations (7) can be written as

$$A\vec{k} = \vec{f} \tag{9}$$

and hence

$$\Sigma(v_1, \ldots, v_s) = \sum_{\substack{\vec{k} \in \mathbb{F}_2^{(v_1-1)+\cdots+(v_s-1)} \\ A\vec{k} = \vec{f}}} 1 = |\{\vec{k} \in \mathbb{F}_2^{(v_1-1)+\cdots+(v_s-1)} : A\vec{k} = \vec{f}\}|.$$

By the definition of the matrix A and since $C_{1,m_i \times m_i}, \ldots, C_{s,m_i \times m_i}$ are the generating matrices of a digital (t, m_i, s)-net over $\mathbb{F}_2$ we have

$$\operatorname{rank}(A) = \begin{cases} (v_1-1)+\cdots+(v_s-1) & \text{if } (v_1-1)+\cdots+(v_s-1) \leq m_i - t, \\ \geq m_i - t & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let L denote the linear space of solutions of the homogeneous system $A\vec{k} = \vec{0}$ and let $\dim(L)$ denote the dimension of L. Then it follows that

$$\dim(L) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } v_1+\cdots+v_s \leq m_i - t + s, \\ \leq v_1+\cdots+v_s - m_i + t - s & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence if $v_1+\cdots+v_s \leq m_i - t + s$ we find that the system (9) has at most 1 solution and if $v_1+\cdots+v_s > m_i - t + s$ the system (9) has at most $2^{v_1+\cdots+v_s-m_i+t-s}$ solutions, i.e.,

$$\Sigma(v_1, \ldots, v_s) \leq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v_1+\cdots+v_s \leq m_i - t + s, \\ 2^{v_1+\cdots+v_s-m_i+t-s} & \text{if } v_1+\cdots+v_s > m_i - t + s. \end{cases}$$

In the following let $\binom{n}{k}$ denote the binomial coefficient, where we set $\binom{n}{k} = 0$ if $k > n$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|\{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathcal{D}_i^* \,:\, k_j > 0, 1 \le j \le s, \mu(\boldsymbol{k}) = z_1\}| \\ &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \binom{z_1+s-1}{s-1} & \text{if } z_1 \le m_i - t + s, \\ \binom{z_1+s-1}{s-1} 2^{z_1 - m_i + t - s} & \text{if } z_1 > m_i - t + s. \end{array} \right. \end{aligned}$$

In general, for $\emptyset \ne u \subseteq \{1, \ldots, s\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|\{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathcal{D}_i^* \,:\, k_j > 0 \text{ for } j \in u, k_j = 0 \text{ otherwise }, \mu(\boldsymbol{k}) = z_1\}| \\ &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \binom{z_1+|u|-1}{|u|-1} & \text{if } z_1 \le m_i - t + |u|, \\ \binom{z_1+|u|-1}{|u|-1} 2^{z_1 - m_i + t - |u|} & \text{if } z_1 > m_i - t + |u|. \end{array} \right. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in general, for $z_1 \ge m_i - t + 1$ we have

$$|\{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathcal{D}_i^* \,:\, \mu(\boldsymbol{k}) = z_1\}| \ll_s \binom{z_1 + s - 1}{s - 1} 2^{z_1 - m_i + t - 1}.$$

Step II Let now $\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathcal{D}_i^*$ and $z_2 = z - z_1$ be fixed and $\mu(k_j) = v_j$ for $1 \le j \le s$. We have $|\widetilde{v}_j - \widetilde{w}_j| \le 2$ and $\boldsymbol{l} \in \mathcal{D}_{i'}^*$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\vec{c}_{1,1} h_{1,0} + \cdots + \vec{c}_{1,b_{1,2}-1} h_{1,b_{1,2}-2} + \vec{c}_{1,b_{1,2}} + \vec{c}_{1,b_{1,1}} + \\ &\vec{c}_{2,1} h_{2,0} + \cdots + \vec{c}_{2,b_{2,2}-1} h_{2,b_{2,2}-2} + \vec{c}_{2,b_{2,2}} + \vec{c}_{2,b_{2,1}} + \\ &\qquad\qquad \vdots \\ &\vec{c}_{s,1} h_{s,0} + \cdots + \vec{c}_{s,b_{s,2}-1} h_{s,b_{s,2}-2} + \vec{c}_{s,b_{s,2}} + \vec{c}_{s,b_{s,1}} \quad = \quad \vec{0}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\vec{c}_{j,0} = \vec{0}$. Note that we consider now $\boldsymbol{k}$ to be fixed, thus the $h_{j,i}$'s are also fixed. Thus it follows that

$$\sum_{j \in \alpha_0} \vec{c}_{j,b_{j,1}} + \sum_{j \in \alpha_{-1}} \vec{c}_{j,b_{j,1}} + \sum_{j \in \alpha_{-2}} (\vec{c}_{j,b_{j,2}} + \vec{c}_{j,b_{j,1}}) = \vec{c},$$

for some vector $\vec{c}$ which is determined by the $h_{i,j}$ which are fixed since $\boldsymbol{k}$ is given. Let $\mu(l_j) = w_j$ for $1 \le j \le s$. Then we have $b_{1,1} + \cdots + b_{s,1} = w_1 + \cdots + w_s = z_2$.

Since h_j is fixed by k_j for $1 \le j \le s$, it follows that for each given set of $b_{j,1}, b_{j,2}$, $1 \le j \le s$, at most one such solution exists.

Now $\boldsymbol{l} \in \mathcal{D}_{i'}^*$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} b_{1,1} + b_{1,2} + b_{2,1} + b_{2,2} + \cdots + b_{s,1} + b_{s,2} > 2m_{i'} - t, \\ z_2 = b_{1,1} + b_{2,1} + \cdots + b_{s,1} > m_{i'} - t, \end{aligned}$$

thus we have

$$b_{1,2} + \cdots + b_{s,2} \geq 2m_{i'} - t - z_2 + 1.$$

Let $b_{j,1} = \delta_j + b_{j,2}$, thus $\delta_j \geq 0$ (where $\delta_j = 0$ if $l_j = 0$). Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} z_2 &= b_{1,1} + \cdots + b_{s,1} \\ &= \delta_1 + \cdots + \delta_s + b_{1,2} + \cdots + b_{s,2} \\ &\geq \delta_1 + \cdots + \delta_s + 2m_{i'} - t - z_2 + 1. \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\delta_1 + \cdots + \delta_s \leq 2z_2 - 2m_{i'} + t.$$

Thus the number of $b_{1,1}, \ldots, b_{s,1}$ with $b_{1,1} + \cdots + b_{s,1} = z_2$ is bounded from above by

$$\sum_{r=0}^{2z_2 - 2m_{i'} + t} \binom{r + s - 1}{s - 1} = \binom{2z_2 - 2m_{i'} + t + s}{s}.$$

Now consider the number of possible choices of $b_{j,2}$. If $j \in \bigcup_{\tau=-1}^{2} \alpha_\tau$, then $b_{j,2}$ is fixed since k_j is fixed and if $j \in \alpha_{-2}$, then $b_{j,1} > b_{j,2} > a_{j,1}$. Note that $b_{j,3}$ is fixed since k_j is fixed for all $1 \leq j \leq s$. By the order 3 digital net property and $\boldsymbol{l} \in \mathcal{D}_{i'}^*$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} b_{1,1} + b_{1,2} + b_{1,3} + \cdots + b_{s,1} + b_{s,2} + b_{s,3} &> 3m_{i'} - t, \\ b_{1,1} + b_{1,2} + \cdots + b_{s,1} + b_{s,2} &> 2m_{i'} - t, \\ z_2 = b_{1,1} + \cdots + b_{s,1} &> m_{i'} - t. \end{aligned}$$

Let $z_2' = b_{1,2} + b_{2,2} + \cdots + b_{s,2} < z_2$. Then

$$b_{1,3} + \cdots + b_{s,3} > 3m_{i'} - t - z_2 - z_2' > 3m_{i'} - t - 2z_2.$$

Let $b_{j,2} = \delta_j' + b_{j,3}$, then $\delta_j' \geq 0$. Then we have

$$z_2 > b_{1,2} + \cdots + b_{s,2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \delta_1' + \cdots + \delta_s' + b_{1,3} + \cdots + b_{s,3} \\ &\geq \delta_1' + \cdots + \delta_s' + 3m_{i'} - t - 2z_2 + 1 \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\delta_1' + \cdots + \delta_s' \leq 3z_2 - 3m_{i'} + t - 1.$$

Thus the number of admissible $b_{1,2}, \ldots, b_{s,2}$ is bounded from above by

$$\sum_{r=0}^{3z_2 - 3m_{i'} + t} \binom{r + s - 1}{s - 1} = \binom{3z_2 - 3m_{i'} + t + s}{s}.$$

Thus we have

$$|R(\boldsymbol{k}, z_2)| \leq \binom{2z_2 - 2m_{i'} + t + s}{s} \binom{3z_2 - 3m_{i'} + t + s}{s}.$$

Inserting the results from Step I and Step II into (6) yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{J}_{i,i'}(z)| \quad \leq \quad & \sum_{z_1 = m_i - t + 1}^{z - m_{i'} + t - 1} 2^{z_1 - m_i + t - 1} \binom{z_1 + s - 1}{s - 1} \\ & \times \binom{2z - 2z_1 - 2m_{i'} + t + s}{s} \binom{3z - 3z_1 - 3m_{i'} + t + s}{s}. \end{aligned}$$

Let now $z = m_i + m_{i'} - 2t + 2 + \kappa$ for $\kappa \geq 0$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathcal{J}(m_i + m_{i'} - 2t + 2 + \kappa)| \\ & \leq \sum_{z_1' = 0}^{\kappa} 2^{z_1'} \binom{z_1' + m_i - t + s}{s - 1} \\ & \quad \times \binom{2(\kappa - z_1') + s + 1 - t}{s} \binom{3(\kappa - z_1') + s + 3 - 2t}{s}. \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$B(z_1', z_2') = 2^{z_1'} \binom{z_1' + m_i - t + s}{s - 1} \binom{2z_2' + s + 1 - t}{s} \binom{3z_2' + s + 3 - 2t}{s}.$$

Notice that one can obtain a similar bound with the roles of $\boldsymbol{k}$ and $\boldsymbol{l}$ interchanged. Thus it follows that

$$|\mathcal{J}_{i,i'}(m_i + m_{i'} - 2t + 2 + \kappa)| \leq \sum_{z_1' = 0}^{\kappa} \min\{B(z_1', \kappa - z_1'), B(\kappa - z_1', z_1')\}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\le 2 \sum_{z_1'=0}^{\lceil \kappa/2 \rceil} \min\{B(z_1', \kappa - z_1'), B(\kappa - z_1', z_1')\} \\
&\le 2 \sum_{z_1'=0}^{\lceil \kappa/2 \rceil} B(z_1', \kappa - z_1') \\
&\le 2^{\kappa/2+2} \sum_{z_1'=0}^{\lceil \kappa/2 \rceil} \binom{z_1' + m_i - t + s}{s-1} \\
&\qquad\qquad \times \binom{2(\kappa - z_1') + s + 1 - t}{s} \binom{3(\kappa - z_1') + s + 3 - 2t}{s}.
\end{aligned}
$$

We have $b_{j,3} \ge a_{j,5}$ for $1 \le j \le s$ by Lemma 1 and by the order 5 digital net property we have (where $t(\alpha')$ is the t-value of the order α' digital (t,s)-sequence for $1 \le \alpha' \le 5$)

$$
\begin{aligned}
&a_{1,1} + a_{1,2} + a_{1,3} + a_{1,4} + a_{1,5} + \cdots + a_{s,1} + a_{s,2} + a_{s,3} + a_{s,4} + a_{s,5} > 5m_i - t(5) \\
&z_1 = a_{1,1} + \cdots + a_{s,1} \ge a_{1,2} + \cdots + a_{s,2} \ge a_{1,3} + \cdots + a_{s,3} \ge a_{1,4} + \cdots + a_{s,4}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus we obtain

$$
z - z_1 = z_2 = b_{1,1} + \cdots + b_{s,1} \ge b_{1,3} + \cdots + b_{s,3} \ge a_{1,5} + \cdots + a_{s,5} \ge 5m_i - t(5) - 4z_1
$$

and therefore

$$
z \ge 5m_i - t(5) - 3z_1 \ge 5m_i - t(5) - 3(m_i - t(1) + 1) = 2m_i - t(5) + 3t(1) - 3.
$$

Analogously we have

$$
z \ge 2m_{i'} - t(5) + 3t(1) - 3.
$$

Thus we have $|\mathcal{J}_{i,i'}(z)| = \emptyset$ if $z < 2\max\{m_i, m_{i'}\} - t(5) + 3t(1) - 3$.

Assume that $i \le i'$, then since $t, t(5), t(1)$ depends only on the dimension s but not on m_i, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}) \in \mathcal{J}_{i,i'}} |r(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l})| &\ll_s \sum_{z=2m_i - t(5) + 3t(1) - 2}^{\infty} \frac{|\mathcal{J}_{i,i'}(z)|}{2^z} \\
&\ll_s \frac{1}{2^{m_i + m_{i'}}} \sum_{\kappa = m_i - m_{i'} + 2t - t(5) + 3t(1) - 4}^{\infty} \frac{|\mathcal{J}_{i,i'}(m_i + m_{i'} - 2t + 2 + \kappa)|}{2^{\kappa}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$\begin{aligned}\ll_s \quad & \frac{1}{2^{(3m_i+m_{i'})/2}} \sum_{\kappa=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{\kappa/2}} \sum_{z_1'=0}^{\lceil(\kappa+m_i-m_{i'}+2t-t(5)+3t(1)-4)/2\rceil} \binom{z_1'+m_i-t+s}{s-1} \\ & \times \binom{2(\kappa-z_1')+s+1-t}{s} \binom{3(\kappa-z_1')+s+3-2t}{s}.\end{aligned}$$

Now the sum over z_1' can be estimated by the number of terms and by substituting the value of z_1' in each binomial coefficient which yields the largest factor. Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l})\in\mathcal{J}_{i,i'}} |r(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l})| \quad \ll_s \quad & \frac{1}{2^{(3m_i+m_{i'})/2}} \sum_{\kappa=0}^{\infty} \frac{\kappa+m_i-m_{i'}+5t}{2^{\kappa/2+1}} \\ & \times \binom{\kappa+2m_i-m_{i'}+4t+s}{s-1} \\ & \times \binom{2\kappa+s+1-t}{s} \binom{3\kappa+s+3-2t}{s}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{2,N}^2(\mathcal{S}_s) \quad \ll_s \quad & \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{1\le i\le i'\le r} (m_i-m_{i'}) 2^{(m_{i'}-m_i)/2} \sum_{\kappa=0}^{\infty} \frac{\kappa}{2^{\kappa/2}} \\ & \times \frac{(\kappa+2m_1+4t+s)^{s-1}}{(s-1)!} \frac{(2\kappa+s+1-t)^s}{s!} \frac{(3\kappa+s+3-2t)^s}{s!}.\end{aligned}$$

Now, for fixed i, we have $\sum_{i'=i}^{r}(m_i-m_{i'})2^{(m_{i'}-m_i)/2} \le \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} q2^{-q/2} < \infty$. Furthermore, we have $m_1 \le (\log N)/(\log 2)$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{2,N}^2(\mathcal{S}_s) \quad \ll_s \quad & \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{\kappa=0}^{\infty} \frac{\kappa^{2s+1}}{2^{\kappa/2}} (\kappa+2m_1+4t+s)^{s-1} \\ \ll_s \quad & \frac{r m_1^{s-1}}{N^2} \sum_{\kappa=0}^{\infty} \frac{\kappa^{3s}}{2^{\kappa/2}} \\ \ll_s \quad & r\frac{(\log N)^{s-1}}{N^2},\end{aligned}$$

where $r = S(N)$ denotes the number of nonzero digits in the binary expansion of N. Thus the result follows by taking the square root. □

4 The proof of Corollary 1

To prove Corollary 1 we first prove a bound on the $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy of order 3 digital nets.

4.1 A bound on the $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy of order 3 digital nets

Theorem 2 *Let* $s, m \in \mathbb{N}$. *For every (digitally shifted) order* 3 *digital* (t,m,s)*-net* $\mathcal{P}_{2^m,s}$ *over* $\mathbb{F}_2$ *we have*

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,2^m}(\mathcal{P}_{2^m,s}) \ll_s \frac{m^{(s-1)/2}}{2^{m-t}}.$$

Proof. Let $C_1, \ldots, C_s \in \mathbb{F}_2^{m \times m}$ be the generating matrices of $\mathcal{P}_{2^m s}$ and recall the definition

$$\mathcal{D} = \{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s : C_1^\top \vec{k}_1 + \cdots + C_s^\top \vec{k}_s \equiv 0 \pmod{2}\}$$

and $\mathcal{D}^* = \mathcal{D} \setminus \{\boldsymbol{0}\}$. Set

$$\mathcal{J} = \{(\boldsymbol{k}, \boldsymbol{l}) \in \mathcal{D}^* \times \mathcal{D}^* : r(\boldsymbol{k}, \boldsymbol{l}) \neq 0\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{J}(z) = \{(\boldsymbol{k}, \boldsymbol{l}) \in \mathcal{J} : \mu(\boldsymbol{k}) + \mu(\boldsymbol{l}) = z\}.$$

Hence $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_{i,i'}$ and $\mathcal{J}(z) = \mathcal{J}_{i,i'}(z)$ from the proof of Theorem 1 with $i = i'$ and $m_i = m$.

We have

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,2^m}^2(\mathcal{P}_{2^m,s}) = \left| \sum_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l} \in \mathcal{D}^*} r(\boldsymbol{k}, \boldsymbol{l}) \mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \mathrm{wal}_{\boldsymbol{l}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \right| \leq \sum_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l} \in \mathcal{D}^*} |r(\boldsymbol{k}, \boldsymbol{l})| = \sum_{(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}) \in \mathcal{J}} |r(\boldsymbol{k}, \boldsymbol{l})|.$$

For $(\boldsymbol{k}, \boldsymbol{l}) \in \mathcal{J}$ we have

$$|r(\boldsymbol{k}, \boldsymbol{l})| \leq \frac{1}{3^s 2^{\mu(\boldsymbol{k}) + \mu(\boldsymbol{l})}}.$$

Thus we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,2^m}^2(\mathcal{P}) \ll_s \sum_{(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{l}) \in \mathcal{J}} \frac{1}{2^{\mu(\boldsymbol{k}) + \mu(\boldsymbol{l})}}.$$

It follows from $\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathcal{D}^*$ that $\mu(\boldsymbol{k}) > m - t$ and from $\boldsymbol{l} \in \mathcal{D}^*$ it follows also that $\mu(\boldsymbol{l}) > m - t$ and hence $\mu(\boldsymbol{k}) + \mu(\boldsymbol{l}) \geq 2(m - t + 1)$.

Thus we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,2^m}^2(\mathcal{P}) \ll_s \sum_{z=2(m-t+1)}^{\infty} \frac{|\mathcal{J}(z)|}{2^z}. \tag{10}$$

From the proof of Theorem 1 (with $i = i'$ and $m_i = m$) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{J}(z)| \ &\leq \sum_{z_1=m-t+1}^{z-m+t-1} 2^{z_1-m+t-1} \binom{z_1 + s - 1}{s - 1} \\ &\qquad \times \binom{2z - 2z_1 - 2m + t + s}{s} \binom{3z - 3z_1 - 3m + t + s}{s}. \end{aligned}$$

Let now $z = 2m - 2t + 2 + \kappa$ for $\kappa \geq 0$. Then we have

$$|\mathcal{J}(2m - 2t + 2 + \kappa)| \leq \sum_{z_1'=0}^{\kappa} B(z_1', \kappa - z_1'),$$

where

$$B(z_1', z_2') = 2^{z_1'} \binom{z_1' + m - t + s}{s - 1} \binom{2z_2' + s + 1 - t}{s} \binom{3z_2' + s + 3 - 2t}{s}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{J}(2m - 2t + 2 + \kappa)| \ &\leq \ 2 \sum_{z_1'=0}^{\lceil \kappa/2 \rceil} \min\{B(z_1', \kappa - z_1'), B(\kappa - z_1', z_1')\} \\ &\leq \ 2 \sum_{z_1'=0}^{\lceil \kappa/2 \rceil} B(z_1', \kappa - z_1') \\ &\leq \ 2^{\kappa/2+2} \sum_{z_1'=0}^{\lceil \kappa/2 \rceil} \binom{z_1' + m - t + s}{s - 1} \\ &\qquad \times \binom{2(\kappa - z_1') + s + 1 - t}{s} \binom{3(\kappa - z_1') + s + 3 - 2t}{s}. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting this result into (10) we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,2^m}^2(\mathcal{P}_{2^m,s}) \ \ll_s \ \frac{1}{2^{2m-2t+2}} \sum_{\kappa=0}^{\infty} \frac{|\mathcal{J}(2m - 2t + 2 + \kappa)|}{2^{\kappa}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{1}{2^{2m-2t}} \sum_{\kappa=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{\kappa/2}} \sum_{z_1'=0}^{\lceil \kappa/2 \rceil} \binom{z_1' + m - t + s}{s-1} \\
&\qquad \times \binom{2(\kappa - z_1') + s + 1 - t}{s} \binom{3(\kappa - z_1') + s + 3 - 2t}{s} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2^{2m-2t}} \sum_{\kappa=0}^{\infty} \frac{\kappa/2+1}{2^{\kappa/2}} \frac{(\kappa + 1 + m - t + s)^{s-1}}{(s-1)!} \\
&\qquad \times \frac{(2\kappa + s + 1 - t)^s}{s!} \frac{(3\kappa + s + 3 - 2t)^s}{s!}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,2^m}^2(\mathcal{P}_{2^m,s}) \ll_s \frac{m^{s-1}}{2^{2m-2t}} \sum_{\kappa=0}^{\infty} \frac{\kappa^{3s}}{2^{\kappa/2}} \ll_s \frac{m^{s-1}}{2^{2m-2t}}.$$

Thus the result follows by taking the square root. □

4.2 The proof of Corollary 1

The proof of Corollary 1 is intimately connected with Theorem 2.

Proof. For an integer $N \geq 2$ we choose $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^{m-1} < N \leq 2^m$. Let $\mathcal{P}_{2^m,s}$ be an order 3 digital (t, m, s)-net over $\mathbb{F}_2$ with the property that the first component of $\mathcal{P}_{2^m,s}$ is a $(0, m, 1)$-net over $\mathbb{F}_2$. Note that such nets exist for every m and can be obtained in the following way: Take the digital sequence introduced in Section 1.2 in dimension $3s-1$. Concatenate the component $n2^{-m}$, so that the new point set is of the form $(n2^{-m}, y_{n,1}, y_{n,2}, \ldots, y_{n,3s-1})$, where $(y_{n,1}, \ldots, y_{n,3s-1})$ is the nth point of the sequence. Apply the digit interleaving composition to this point set. Then the point set $(n2^{-m}, y_{n,1}, y_{n,2})$ for $0 \leq n < 2^m$ is a digital $(0, m, 3)$-net and therefore [10, Proposition 1] shows that the first component of the order 3 digital net obtained this way is a digital $(0, m, 1)$-net.

Note that the quality parameter t only depends on s and not on m. We now proceed as in [4]. According to Theorem 2 we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,2^m}(\mathcal{P}_{2^m,s}) \ll_s \frac{m^{(s-1)/2}}{2^m}. \tag{11}$$

As shown above, the first component of $\mathcal{P}_{2^m,s}$ is a digital $(0, m, 1)$-net over $\mathbb{F}_2$. Hence the subset

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{N,s} := \mathcal{P}_{2^m,s} \cap \left(\left[0, \frac{N}{2^m} \right) \times [0,1)^{s-1} \right)$$

contains exactly N points. We define the point set

$$\mathcal{P}_{N,s} := \left\{ \left(\frac{2^m}{N} x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_s \right) \,:\, (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_s) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{N,s} \right\}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(N\mathcal{L}_{2,N}(\mathcal{P}_{N,s}))^2 &= \int_{[0,1]^s} \left| A\left([\mathbf{0},\boldsymbol{y}), N, \mathcal{P}_{N,s}\right)\right) - N\lambda_s([\mathbf{0},\boldsymbol{y}))|^2 \,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{y} \\
&= \int_0^1 \cdots \int_0^1 \left| A\left(\left[0, y_1 N 2^{-m}\right) \times \prod_{i=2}^s [0, y_i), N, \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{N,s} \right) \right. \\
&\qquad\qquad \left. - 2^m \frac{N}{2^m} y_1 \cdots y_s \right|^2 \mathrm{d}y_1 \cdots \mathrm{d}y_s \\
&= \frac{2^m}{N} \int_0^{N/2^m} \int_0^1 \cdots \int_0^1 \left| A([\mathbf{0},\boldsymbol{y}), N, \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{N,s}) - 2^m \lambda_s([\mathbf{0},\boldsymbol{y})) \right|^2 \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{y} \\
&= \frac{2^m}{N} \int_0^{N/2^m} \int_0^1 \cdots \int_0^1 \left| A([\mathbf{0},\boldsymbol{y}), 2^m, \mathcal{P}_{2^m,s}) - 2^m \lambda_s([\mathbf{0},\boldsymbol{y})) \right|^2 \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{y} \\
&\le \frac{2^m}{N} \left(2^m \mathcal{L}_{2,2^m}(\mathcal{P}_{2^m,s}) \right)^2 .
\end{aligned}$$

With (11) we obtain

$$(N\mathcal{L}_{2,N}(\mathcal{P}_{N,s}))^2 \ll_s \frac{2^m}{N} m^{s-1} \ll_s (\log N)^{s-1}.$$

Taking the square root and dividing by N we finally obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,N}(\mathcal{P}_{N,s}) \ll_s \frac{(\log N)^{(s-1)/2}}{N}.$$

□

5 Acknowledgements

H. Niederreiter also independently suggested recently that higher order nets may achieve the optimal rate of convergence of the $\mathcal{L}_2$ discrepancy.

References

[1] N. L. Bassily and I. Kátai, Distribution of the values of q-additive functions on polynomial sequences. Acta Math. Hungar., **68**, 353–361, 1995.

[2] J. Beck and W. W. L. Chen, *Irregularities of Distribution.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987.

[3] H. Chaix, H. Faure, Discrépance et diaphonie en dimension un. Acta Arith., **63**, 103–141, 1993.

[4] W. W. L. Chen and M. M. Skriganov, Explicit constructions in the classical mean squares problem in irregularity of point distribution. J. Reine Angew. Math., **545**, 67–95, 2002.

[5] W. W. L. Chen and M. M. Skriganov, Orthogonality and digit shifts in the classical mean squares problem in irregularities of point distribution. In: *Diophantine approximation*, pp. 141–159, Dev. Math., 16, SpringerWienNewYork, Vienna, 2008.

[6] H.E. Chrestenson, A class of generalized Walsh functions, Pacific J. Math., **5**, 17–31, 1955.

[7] H. Davenport, Note on irregularities of distribution. Mathematika, **3**, 131–135, 1956.

[8] J. Dick, Explicit constructions of quasi-Monte Carlo rules for the numerical integration of high-dimensional periodic functions. SIAM J. Numer. Anal., **45**, 2141–2176, 2007.

[9] J. Dick, Walsh spaces containing smooth functions and quasi-Monte Carlo rules of arbitrary high order. SIAM J. Numer. Anal., **46**, 1519–1553, 2008.

[10] J. Dick, On quasi-Monte Carlo rules achieving higher order convergence. Monte Carlo and quasi-Monte Carlo methods 2008, 73–96, Springer, Berlin, 2009.

[11] J. Dick and F. Pillichshammer, On the mean square weighted L_2 discrepancy of randomized digital (t, m, s)-nets over $\mathbb{Z}_2$. Acta Arith., **117**, 371–403, 2005.

[12] J. Dick and F. Pillichshammer, *Digital nets and Sequences. Discrepancy theory and quasi-Monte Carlo Integration.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.

[13] M. Drmota R. F. and Tichy, *Sequences, discrepancies and applications.* Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1651, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1997.

[14] H. Faure and F. Pillichshammer, L_2 discrepancy of two-dimensional digitally shifted Hammersley point sets in base b. In: *Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods 2008*, L'Ecuyer, P. and Owen, A. (eds.), pp. 355–368, Springer, Berlin, 2009.

[15] H. Faure and F. Pillichshammer, L_p discrepancy of generalized two-dimensional Hammersley point sets. Monatsh. Math., **158**, 31–61, 2009.

[16] H. Faure, F. Pillichshammer, G. Pirsic, and W. Ch. Schmid, L_2 discrepancy of generalized two-dimensional Hammersley point sets scrambled with arbitrary permutations. Acta Arith., **141**, 395–418, 2010.

[17] K. K. Frolov, Upper bound of the discrepancy in metric L_p, $2 \leq p < \infty$, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, **252**, 805–807, 1980.

[18] V.S. Grozdanov, On the diaphony of one class of one-dimensional sequences. Int. J. Math. Math. Sci., **19**, 115–124, 1996.

[19] P. Kritzer and F. Pillichshammer, An exact formula for the L_2 discrepancy of the shifted Hammersley point set. Unif. Distrib. Theory, **1**, 1–13, 2006.

[20] L. Kuipers and H. Niederreiter, *Uniform Distribution of Sequences.* John Wiley, New York, 1974.

[21] G. Larcher and F. Pillichshammer, Walsh series analysis of the $\mathcal{L}_2$-discrepancy of symmetrisized point sets. Monatsh. Math., **132**, 1–18, 2001.

[22] G. Larcher and F. Pillichshammer, Moments of the weighted sum-of-digits function. Quaest. Math., **28**, 321–336, 2005.

[23] E. Manstavičius, Probabilistic theory of additive functions related to systems of numeration. In: *New trends in probability and statistics*, Vol. 4 (Palanga, 1996), 413–429, VSP, Utrecht, 1997.

[24] J. Matoušek, *Geometric discrepancy. An illustrated guide.* Algorithms and Combinatorics, 18. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.

[25] H. Niederreiter, Application of Diophantine approximations to numerical integration. In: *Diophantine approximation and its applications (Proc. Conf., Washington, D.C., 1972)*, pp. 129–199. Academic Press, New York, 1973.

[26] H. Niederreiter, Low-discrepancy point sets, Monatsh. Math., **102**, 155–167, 1986.

[27] H. Niederreiter, *Random Number Generation and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods.* No. 63 in CBMS-NSF Series in Applied Mathematics, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1992.

[28] H. Niederreiter and C. P. Xing, Low-discrepancy sequences and global function fields with many rational places. Finite Fields Appl., **2**, 241–273, 1996.

[29] P.D. Proinov, On the L^2 discrepancy of some infinite sequences. Serdica, **11**, 3–12, 1985.

[30] P. D. Proinov, Symmetrization of the van der Corput generalized sequences, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci., **64**, 159–162, 1988.

[31] P.D. Proinov, V.S. Grozdanov, On the diaphony of the van der Corput-Halton sequence. J. Number Theory, **30**, 94–104, 1988.

[32] K. F. Roth, On irregularities of distribution. Mathematika, **1**, 73–79, 1954.

[33] K. F. Roth, On irregularities of distribution III, Acta Arith., **35**, 373–384, 1979.

[34] K. F. Roth, On irregularities of distribution IV. Acta Arith., **37**, 67–75, 1980.

[35] M. M. Skriganov, Harmonic analysis on totally disconnected groups and irregularities of point distributions. J. Reine Angew. Math., **600**, 25–49, 2006.

[36] I. H. Sloan and H. Woźniakowski, When are quasi-Monte Carlo algorithms efficient for high dimensional integrals? J. Complexity, **14**, 1–33, 1998.

[37] I. M. Sobol, The distribution of points in a cube and the approximate evaluation of integrals, Zh. Vychisl. Mat. i Mat. Fiz., **7**, 784–802, 1967.

[38] J. L. Walsh, A closed set of normal orthogonal functions. Amer. J. Math., **55**, 5–24, 1923.

[39] H. Woźniakowski, Average case complexity of multivariate integration. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. New Series, **24**, 185–194, 1991.

[40] S. K. Zaremba, Some applications of multidimensional integration by parts. Ann. Polon. Math., **21**, 85–96, 1968.

Author's Addresses:

Josef Dick, School of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia. Email: josef.dick@unsw.edu.au

Friedrich Pillichshammer, Institut für Analysis, Universität Linz, Altenbergerstraße 69, A-4040 Linz, Austria. Email: friedrich.pillichshammer@jku.at